

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/237,291	01/25/1999	JUDY CAROL YOUNG	SYS-2068	9391	
1095 NOVARTIS	7590 02/12/200	7	EXAM	EXAMINER	
CORPORATE ONE HEALTH	NTELLECTUAL PROPERTY	OPERTY	MONTANAR	MONTANARI, DAVID A	
	ER, NJ 07936-1080	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			1632		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			02/12/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/237,291	YOUNG ET AL.		
Examiner	. Art Unit		
David Montanari	1632		

			.002	
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE	REPLY FILED 26 January 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
	The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, at stice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in se with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply m	fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	rce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
	The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing			•
b)	The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or	ater than SIX MONTHS from the maili	ng date of the final rejecti	on.
	TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7		E FIRST REPLT WAS F	ILED WITHIN
have under set fo may r	sions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the 1th in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late educe any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) ICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply ori or than three months after the mailing d	of the fee. The appropri	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
	The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), t	o avoid dismissal of th	is of the date of e appeal. Since
<u>AME</u>	NDMENTS	·	` ,	•
3. 🛚	The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brie	f, will <u>not</u> be entered be	ecause
	(a) They raise new issues that would require further co	nsideration and/or search (see NC	TE below);	
	(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below			
	(c) They are not deemed to place the application in beta appeal; and/or			the issues for
	(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		jected claims	
	NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		•	
	The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1.		ompliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. 🔲	1, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			
6. 🗌	non-allowable claim(s).			
7. 🔀	For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ill be entered and an e	explanation of
	Claim(s) allowed: <u>NONE</u> .			
	Claim(s) objected to: <u>NONE</u> .			
	Claim(s) rejected: <u>18-20,23-27,31-34,37-43,46,47 and 52</u> Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>NONE</u> .			
AFFI	DAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
	The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bubecause applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
9. 🔲	The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome all rejections under appe	eal and/or appellant fai	ls to provide a
	The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio UEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			·
	☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	nt does NOT place the application	in condition for allowar	nce because:
12. [Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).		
	Other:			
	·			
		•		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicants argue in amendment filed 1/26/2007 that in response to Examiner's arguments in the previous Office action mailed on 7/26/2006, they have amended claims 18, 23, 37, and 52 to include the limitation "and wherein said concentration range does not cause differentiation of the human pluripotent hematopoietic stem cells". Applicants have taken the position that by adding the wherein clause to the above amdended claims that the art of record would not longer be applicable on the basis that Young et al. teach that TPO does cause some differentiation that this would not motivate the ordinary artisan. However this is not persuasive.

Young et al. address this issue regarding TPO and differentiation on pg. 1625 Col. 2 under the "Blast Cell" outgrowths from single PHP heading. Young et al. teaches that approximately 75% of the single CD34+Thy-1+Lin- cells from ABM that proliferated in the presence of TPO did not display differentiation to morphologically mature MK. Futher Young et al. teaches a rational for why differentiation is occuring, mainly IL-3. Young et al states that "IL-3 plus TPO produced much more cell proliferation thatn TPO alone but drove cells to differentiate (detected by loss of CD34 expression)". Further Young et al. states that "The effects of IL-3 appeared to override the effects of TPO, because TPO plus IL-3 game similar results to IL-3 alone for cell activation, cycling, and loss of CD34 expression" (pg. 1630, col. 1 lines 6-12). Thus the ordinary artisan, in view of Applicants amendments to the above stated claims would still be motivated to combine and use the teachings of Dao et al. and Young et al. and thus for reasons of record and above the rejection is maintained.

Further Applicants amendment to the claims raises the issue of new matter since there is no teaching that the concentrations that the amended wherein clause states will not cause differentiation.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Montanari whose telephone number is 1-571-272-3108. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Tr 8-6. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Paras can be reached on 1-571-272-4517. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

David A. Montanari, Ph.D.

SUMESH KAUSHAL, PH.D. PRIMARY EXAMINER